



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,487	10/15/2004	Daniele Bonnet-Delpo	RN02047G1	4451
7590	11/21/2006			EXAMINER DAVIS, BRIAN J
Jean Louis Seugnet Rhodia Inc CN 7500 Intellectual Property Department 259 Prospect Plains Road Cranbury, NJ 08512-7500			ART UNIT 1621	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 11/21/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/511,487	BONNET-DELPON ET AL.
	Examiner Brian J. Davis	Art Unit 1621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 15-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 15-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the specification contains errors and/or apparent inconsistencies. For instance, it appears that the structure on page 9 of the specification is incomplete (missing NH₂). It also appears that example 10 contains two separate syntheses. It is unclear why this is so unless, perhaps, there is a lacuna in the text. It is also unclear why the text of the specification explicitly and repeatedly refers to a "difluoromethyl" while the supporting examples are, consistently, trifluoromethyl compounds. Appropriate clarification of all points above is required

The examiner also respectfully requests applicant's assistance in correcting any other minor errors/inconsistencies that might appear in the specification, including errors of grammar and spelling.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compounds of formula I, does not reasonably provide enablement for "a compound comprising at least one carbon bearing an amine

Art Unit: 1621

function, and allyl or propargyl radical, a difluoromethylene group and a hydrogen or hydrocarbon-based radical which is electron donating or weakly electron-withdrawing with a $\sigma_p \leq 0.2$ ". The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

With regard to rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, the following factors are considered (*In re Wands* 8 USPQ 2d 1400, 1404 (CAFC 1988)): a) Breadth of claims; b) Nature of invention; c) State of the prior art; d) Level of ordinary skill in the art; e) Level of predictability in the art; f) Amount of direction and guidance provided by the inventor; g) Working examples and; h) Level of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

a)The claim is incredibly broad. In fact, only one atom (a carbon atom) and its substituents is even remotely defined – and those definitions are simply broad classes of substituents – of a possibly much larger molecule (...30 carbon atoms (claim 17)).

b,c)The nature of the invention is determined in part by the state of the prior art. The prior art in general teaches compounds and methods relating to that of the instant invention. That is, compounds, their synthesis and method of use are all explicitly defined and limited by the explicit and detailed structures of the compounds themselves.

d)The level of skill in the art is considered to be relatively high.

e)The level of predictability in the art is considered to be relatively low. Even under the best of circumstances, and several hundred years after Lavoisier laid the foundations of its modern practice, chemistry remains an experimental science. The

chemical arts have not advanced to the point where certainty has replaced the need for laboratory experimentation.

f,g)The amount of direction provided by the inventor is considered to be determined by the specification and the working examples. Applicant provides a narrow set of exemplified compounds all of which are closely structurally related (Examples 1-12).

h)It is not possible to make and use the instant invention without an undue level of experimentation. The breathtaking scope of applicant's claims simply strains credulity. Applicant's examples cannot reasonably be extrapolated to encompass the instant universe of compounds. The specification must teach how to make and use the invention, not how to figure out for oneself how to make and use the invention. *In re Gardner*, 166 USPQ 138 (CCPA 1970).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for specific, very narrow examples of imine and allyl starting compounds, used to synthesize compounds of formula I, does not reasonably provide enablement for "reacting an allyl organometallic on and imine bearing difluoromethylene groups" to yield compounds of formula I. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

As above, with regard to rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, the following factors are considered (*In re Wands* 8 USPQ 2d 1400, 1404 (CAFC 1988).

- a)The claim is incredibly broad: the universe of allyl organometallic compounds reacted with the universe of imine-bearing difluoromethylene groups.
- b,c)The nature of the invention is determined in part by the state of the prior art. The prior art in general teaches compounds and methods relating to that of the instant invention. That is, compounds, their synthesis and method of use are all explicitly defined and limited by the explicit and detailed structures of the compounds themselves.
- d)The level of skill in the art is considered to be relatively high.
- e)The level of predictability in the art is considered to be relatively low. Even under the best of circumstances, and several hundred years after Lavoisier laid the foundations of its modern practice, chemistry remains an experimental science. The chemical arts have not advanced to the point where certainty has replaced the need for laboratory experimentation.
- f,g)The amount of direction provided by the inventor is considered to be determined by the specification and the working examples. Applicant provides a narrow set of exemplified compounds all of which are closely structurally related (Examples 1-7) and all of which are synthesized from specific, very narrow examples of imine and allyl starting compounds.
- h)It is not possible to make and use the instant invention without an undue level of experimentation. The breathtaking scope of applicant's claims simply strains credulity. Applicant's examples cannot reasonably be extrapolated to encompass the instant universe of starting compounds. The specification must teach how to make and

use the invention, not how to figure out for oneself how to make and use the invention.

In re Gardner, 166 USPQ 138 (CCPA 1970).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The exact nature of the compound is unclear because it is undefined – except for one atom (a carbon atom) and its substituents – and those definitions are simply broad classes of substituents – of a possibly much larger molecule (...30 carbon atoms (claim 17)).

Claims 18 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See PEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by

such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, and 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, the claims recite, in the definition of R₃, the broad recitation "alkyl," and the claims also recite "including a alkyl...," which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Additionally, claims 18 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because it is unclear, in the definition of R₃, how are R₃ and R₄ can form an "additional" double bond. Does applicant wish to suggests that a propargyl radical, in some fashion, consists of two (isolated?) double bonds, or perhaps a quadruple bond? Either choice would seem incorrect: the first because it is inconsistent with the definition of a propargyl radical and the second because it is inconsistent with valance bond theory. Variable R is also undefined.

Additionally, claims 18 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because there is no antecedent basis for the limitation "said Ar group" in the definition of R₅ and R₄.

Additionally, claims 18 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because it is unclear exactly what might be the "specific trivalent, nitrile or acid function" substituent in the definition of R₁,R₂,R₄,R₃ and R₅.

Additionally, claims 18 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because it is unclear exactly what the starting materials of the reaction might be (...reacting an allyl organometallic on an imine bearing difluoromethylene groups...). These sets of starting materials are simply broad sets of general chemical classes.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The exact nature of a "Barbier" technique is unclear because it is undefined.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The exact nature of the "hydrocarbon-based radical which is electron donating or weakly electron-withdrawing" is unclear because it is undefined. That is, the substituent is defined simply by properties it must have, not by what it is. The specification must teach how to make and use the invention, not how to figure out for oneself how to make and use the invention. *In re Gardner*, 166 USPQ 138 (CCPA 1970).

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As above, a broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. In the present instance, the claim recites the broad recitation "at least equal to 10," and the claim also recites "optionally at least equal to 20," which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The exact nature of the compound of formula IV is unclear because it is undefined.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The exact nature of the GEA substituent is unclear because it is undefined. That is, the substituent is defined simply by properties it must have, not by what it is. The specification must teach how to make and use the invention, not how to figure out for oneself how to make and use the invention. *In re Gardner*, 166 USPQ 138 (CCPA 1970).

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

Art Unit: 1621

regards as the invention. There is no antecedent basis for the limitation "C_v,F_{v+1}" in the definition of Rf.

Claim 28 provides for the use of a compound of formula (I) in a process for cyclizing metathesis, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

The remaining claims are also rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as claims which depend from indefinite claims are also indefinite. *Ex parte Cordova*, 10 USPQ 2d 1949, 1952 (PTO Bd. App. 1989).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by *Chemistry Letters* (1989), 11, p. 1987-1988 (CAPLUS abstract). Applicant's compounds are old and well known in the chemical arts. For instance, the cited reference teaches examples of applicant's compounds: RN=127560-68-3 and 127560-75-2.

Claims 18, 20, 21 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by *Tetrahedron Letters* (1990), 31(29), p. 4143-4144. The reference teaches applicant's reaction of a "allyl organometallic on an imine bearing difluoromethylene" (page 4143 second diagramed reaction).

Claims 18, 20, 21 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by *Journal of Organic Chemistry* (1968), 33(3), p. 1002-1008. The reference teaches applicant's reaction of a "allyl organometallic on an imine bearing difluoromethylene" (page 1006, Table III).

Claims 18, 20, 21 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by *Journal of Organic Chemistry* (1996), 61(21), p. 7521-7528. The reference teaches applicant's reaction of a "allyl organometallic on an imine bearing difluoromethylene" (page 7523, Scheme 7, Table 1 entry 9).

Art Unit: 1621

Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* (2001), p. 3891-3897. The reference teaches a process for cyclizing metathesis using applicant's compound (Results section).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Davis whose telephone number is 571-272-0638. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page can be reached on 571-272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/511,487

Art Unit: 1621


BRIAN DAVIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Brian J. Davis

November 12, 2006

Page 13